Remarks

Claims 1, 19 and 27 have been amended. No claims have been canceled.

Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-8, 19-23, 25 and 27-30 are presented for examination.

In a final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 19-21, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 30 stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,671,757). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Multer.

Multer discloses a system for synchronizing devices which can be coupled to a

network. See Multer at Abstract. Multer further discloses using a "change log" that

describes a series of sync transactions for the system to perform on the device. See

Multer at col. 12, ll. 27-28. The system also includes a delta module which performs the

synchronization operations based on triggers such as when to sync and how to sync. See

Multer at col. 13, ll. 7-9. Some of these triggers include: manually triggering when a user

presses the "sync" button or time-based triggers. See Multer at col. 35, ll. 13-22.

Claim 1 of the present application recites the wireless device initiating

synchronization with a server by transmitting the batch transaction update to the server.

Applicants submit that Multer does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Multer

discloses a delta module which performs synchronization operations based on triggers.

See Multer at col. 13, ll. 7-8. However, Multer fails to disclose or suggest a wireless

device initiating synchronization. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Multer.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from claim 1 and include additional features.

Therefore, claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also patentable over Multer.

Claim 19 recites a wireless device having control logic to initiate synchronization

with a server by transmitting a batch transaction update to the server based upon the

batch transaction update reaching a predetermined size. Thus, for reasons described

above with respect to claim 1, claim 19 is also patentable over Multer. Because claims 20-23 and 25 depend from claim 19 and contain additional features, claims 20-23 and 25 are also patentable over Multer.

Claim 27 recites causing a machine to initiate synchronization with a server by transmitting a batch transaction update to the server. Thus, for reasons described above with respect to claim 1, claim 27 is also patentable over Multer. Because claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and contain additional features, claims 28-30 are also patentable over Multer.

Claims 3, 22, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,757) in view of Herrod et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,203). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Multer in view of Herrod.

Herrod discloses that in order to avoid loss of data when a mobile computer goes out of range of an access point, all data collected during the out of range time is stored in the mobile computer. Then when the mobile computer reestablished a connection the collected data is uploaded to a host computer. See Herrod at col. 7, ll. 23-32. However, Herrod fails to disclose or suggest a wireless device initiating synchronization.

As discussed above, Multer does not disclose or suggest a wireless device initiating synchronization. Since neither Multer nor Herrod disclose or suggest a wireless device initiating synchronization, any combination of Multer and Herrod would not disclose or suggest the feature. Therefore, the present claims are patentable over Multer in view of Herrod.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Multer et al. in view of Przybysz (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,695). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Multer in view of Przybysz.

Przybysz discloses a telecommunications system in which a high-availability intelligent node maintains synchronization of data between various nodes by utilizing both an index manager to administer and manage indices associated with the location of stored data, and a data transfer function to manage persistent dynamic data updates between nodes. See Przybysz at Abstract. However, Przybysz fails to disclose or suggest a wireless device initiating synchronization.

As discussed above, Multer does not disclose or suggest such a feature. Since neither Multer nor Przybysz disclose or suggest a wireless device initiating synchronization, any combination of Multer and Przybysz would not disclose or suggest a wireless device initiating synchronization. Therefore, the present claims are patentable over Multer in view of Przybysz.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome, and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 7, 2005

_____

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980